Date: Fri, 2 Apr 93 04:30:04 PST

From: Packet-Radio Mailing List and Newsgroup <packet-radio@ucsd.edu>

Errors-To: Packet-Radio-Errors@UCSD.Edu

Reply-To: Packet-Radio@UCSD.Edu

Precedence: Bulk

Subject: Packet-Radio Digest V93 #87

To: packet-radio

Packet-Radio Digest Fri, 2 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 87

Today's Topics:

AX.25

Baycom modem mod
Bit-Regenerator (3 msgs)
I need G8BPQ 4.04
MSD caveat...
pmnos ver 1d (2 msgs)

Request: Modification instructions for Radio Shack HTX-202. (2 msgs) RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion summary 3/31] (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Packet-Radio@UCSD.Edu> Send subscription requests to: <Packet-Radio-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu> Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Packet-Radio Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/packet-radio".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 1 Apr 1993 18:29:02 GMT

From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: AX.25

To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

tcline@hplvec.LVLD.HP.COM (Ted Cline) writes:

>I have uploaded the "AX.25 Amateur Packet-Radio Link-Layer Protocol, >Version 2.0 October 1984" specification as ax25.doc in /hamradio/packet/ >on ucsd.edu . If you have problems getting the file, I'll be pleased to >email it to you.

I've hesitated to put this file out for FTP in the past, as it's incomplete. The introductory information (and the ARRL copyright notice!) has been stripped off the front, and the state tables are missing from the end. It's almost completely impossible to construct

or troubleshoot the protocol without the state tables.

Jon Bloom at the League has said it's ok to distribute the protocol specification as long as it's complete and retains the ARRL Copyright statement, so I'm going to remove the existing file - and hope that someone does provide the complete electronic version.

- Brian

Date: 1 Apr 1993 21:36:02 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!zazen!

news.uwsuper.edu!hp.uwsuper.edu!pmcgilla@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Baycom modem mod
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Ηi,

Would it be possible to change the crystal freq and get a higher baud rate than the standard 1200 baud. I will be using these modems on a special application in the 155mhz band so incompatability will not be a problem.

Any thoughts anyone?

- -

Patrick L. McGillan
Computer Systems Specialist

University Of Wisconsin Ph: (715) 394-8191 Superior, Wisconsin pmcgilla@uwsuper.edu

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 14:32:01 GMT

From: newsgate.watson.ibm.com!yktnews.watson.ibm.com!sernews!news@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Bit-Regenerator To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Anyone know anything about Bit-Regenerators? I'd like to find a circuit to put into a TNC-2 to make it a Bit-Regenerator.

73's de Jack - kf5mg

AX25net - kf5mg@kf5mg.#dfw.tx.usa.na - (817) 962-4409 AMPRnet - kf5mg@kf5mg.ampr.org - 44.28.0.14

Internet - kf5mg@vnet.ibm.com

IBMipnet - kf5mg@jgrass.dfw.ibm.com - 9.19.193.105

Date: Thu, 01 Apr 93 14:47:37 GMT

From: newsgate.watson.ibm.com!yktnews.watson.ibm.com!watson!@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Bit-Regenerator To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Anyone have a circuit to add to a TNC-2 to make it a bit-regenerator? What firmware (EPROM) would I use to do that? Will a TheNet X1G EPROM work? Thanks.

73's de Jack - kf5mg

AX25net - kf5mg@kf5mg.#dfw.tx.usa.na - (817) 962-4409 AMPRnet kf5mg@kf5mg.ampr.org44.28.0.14kf5mg@vnet.ibm.com

Internet

IBMipnet - kf5mg@jgrass.dfw.ibm.com - 9.19.193.105

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 18:41:01 +0000

From: agate!doc.ic.ac.uk!pipex!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@ames.arpa

Subject: Bit-Regenerator To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr01.144737.5743@watson.ibm.com> kf5mg@VNET.IBM.COM writes:

- > Anyone have a circuit to add to a TNC-2 to make it a bit-regenerator?
- > What firmware (EPROM) would I use to do that? Will a TheNet X1G
- > EPROM work? Thanks.

- > 73's de Jack kf5mg
- > AX25net kf5mg@kf5mg.#dfw.tx.usa.na (817) 962-4409
- kf5mg@kf5mg.ampr.org 44.28.0.14 > AMPRnet
- kf5mg@vnet.ibm.com > Internet
- kf5mg@jgrass.dfw.ibm.com 9.19.193.105 > IBMipnet

At a guess, all you need to do is implement the TAPR DCD state machine, remove the SIO chip, wire RXDA to TXDA and wire the DCD from the state machine to the PTT line. By doing it this way, your TX will key up when the TNC detects something like valid data on the input, and the RXD<>TXD link will cause the TX to exactly reproduce what is being received on the input.

Another method is to put a KISS eprom in the TNC (G8BPQ s/w has a suitable KISS-only rom image) and wire the RXD to TXD on the RS232 connector. This will cause the TNC to receive a packet, send it out on the RS232, receive the same packet on the RS232 and then TX it when the channel is clear.

Obviously the first method is only suitable for repeater-like operation, because the RX and TX are simultaneous, and there is no checksum calculations done. It does provide a means of avoiding the 'hidden station effect' because if all the users TX on the repeater input freq and listen to the repeater output freq, it will hold off all other users (who see a 'busy' channel) when any one is transmitting. It isn't 100% though!

73.....Dave

Date: 1 Apr 93 14:22:06 +1000

From: munnari.oz.au!newshost.anu.edu.au!sserve!hhcs.gov.au!hhcs.gov.au!

news@uunet.uu.net

Subject: I need G8BPQ 4.04 To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Mar17.220623.25836@oz.plymouth.edu> Michael L. Anderson,
m_ander@oz.plymouth.edu writes:

> I'm looking for version 4.04 of G8BPQ, but can only find > version 4.06. Anyone know where 4.04 is? Thanks in advance.

Why do you need v4.04? There is nothing 4..04 will do that 4.06 will not!

Carl. vk1kcm.

Carl Makin (VK1KCM)

Internet: makinc@hhcs.gov.au

Amprnet: vk1kcm@vk1kcm.act.aus.oc

"Life is something to do when you can't get to sleep."

- Fran Lebowitz

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 1993 22:30:51 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!mcdchg!laidbak!psinntp!

psinntp!wrldlnk!usenet@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: MSD caveat...
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Just one caution about MSD -- in regard to the IRQ display, I have

found that it can be misleading. I have added an I/O board to my PC as COM3 at IRQ5, but MSD shows the COM3 IRQ as 4. This means that it is not actually determining the IRQ but rather is showing the non-standard standard value for the COM port, which it is detecting.

Otherwise it is a useful program.

-Seth

Seth M. Dworken, KC3IL Internet: p00123@psilink.com
Fairless Hills, PA Packet Radio: kc3il@kb1bd.nj.usa.na
coming soon -> AMPR Net: kc3il@kc3il.ampr.org

work: sethd@eng.dowjones.com [44.80.8.49]

|-Internet to Packet gateway: bbs@w2xo.pgh.pa.us |- w/ first line of message: sp kc3il@kb1bd.nj.usa.na

Packet to Internet gateway: kc3il@w2xo.#wpa.pa.usa.na

"It rainbow spiral around and around, it tremble and explode!"

Date: 1 Apr 93 16:37:57 GMT From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu

Subject: pmnos ver 1d To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

I recently downloaded pmnos version 1d from UCSD incoming directory but have been unable to unzip the file. PKUNZIP reports 'compression method unknown.'

How do I unzip this file? Any help would be appreciated. 73, Mark. aa2ma.

Mark Morgida D/EECS, US Military Academy West Point, NY 10996

Internet: dm8981@eecs1.eecs.usma.edu

Date: 2 Apr 93 00:22:23 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!mstar!n8emr!gws@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: pmnos ver 1d To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu In article <9304011637.AA24747@eecs1.eecs.usma.edu> dm8981@eecs1.EECS.USMA.EDU (Morgida Mark MAJ) writes:

>I recently downloaded pmnos version 1d from UCSD incoming directory >but have been unable to unzip the file. PKUNZIP reports 'compression >method unknown.'

You may find that yo need to get the new zip/unzip pkz204g. People tying to save a bit here and there now have a new version of zip that cant zip in the old format (but will unzip it) and on top of that virus checkers reports a virus on the .exe when there is none.

- -

Gary W. Sanders gws@n8emr.cmhnet.org, 72277,1325 N8EMR @ N8JYV (ip addr) 44.70.0.1 [Ohio AMPR address coordinator] HAM BBS 614-895-2553 (1200/2400/V.32/PEP) Voice: 614-895-2552 (eves/weekends)

Date: 1 Apr 93 17:05:00 GMT

From: noc.near.net!saturn.caps.maine.edu!maine.maine.edu!umasp@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Request: Modification instructions for Radio Shack HTX-202.

To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

I am making this post for my nephew who doesn't have access to Netnews. He currently has a Radio Shack HTX-202, 2-meter radio and was looking to make modifications. If anyone has any instructions for modifying the frequency or other modification information regarding the HTX-202 it would be greatly appreciated. Information can be sent directly to me and I will forward to him. He has mail capability, but not much else.

Thank you,

George Newell
umasp@maine.maine.edu
umasp@maine.bitnet

Date: Fri, 2 Apr 1993 03:27:29 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!att-out!cbfsb!

cbnewsb.cb.att.com!wa2ise@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Request: Modification instructions for Radio Shack HTX-202.

To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

There are none.

Date: 1 Apr 93 08:12:09 GMT

From: pacbell.com!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion summary 3/31]

To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Scanning through the discussion that has been posted on news.groups so far, there appears to be support for a reorganization of rec.radio.amateur. I've taken a tally, though I want to caution everyone that THESE ARE NOT VOTES because voting won't occur unless the discussion phase shows enough support to allow us to proceed to a vote.

Tally so far: 13 in favor, 7 opposed, 8 unclear or undecided Several of the "in favor" messages included modifications to the RFD which may or may not be conditional. So this number represents 13 in favor of a split but not necessarily for the exact proposal in the RFD.

WHAT WE NEED TO DO NOW IS BRING TOGETHER THE SUGGESTIONS WE HAVE INTO A NEW PROPOSAL WHICH CAN BECOME THE "CALL FOR VOTES". IF YOU SUPPORT A SPLIT OF REC.RADIO.AMATEUR, YOU NEED TO REMEMBER THIS IS A DEMOCRATIC PROCESS - LET'S TRY TO MAKE A PROPOSAL THAT CAN PASS A VOTE ON THE NEWSGROUP AND WORK IN PRACTICE. That will mean that probably no one will get exactly what they want. We need to be patient with the fact that other people have input too.

Of the suggestions made for changes, I would like to handle these the same was we did on the rra-reorg mail list. A suggestion needs to appear more than once (by different people) and outnumber the opposing opinions in order to make it in.

Suggestions which more than one person suggested were as follows (opposition is unknown so these are still open for discussion):

- * r.r.a.products should be renamed r.r.a.equipment
- this was a common theme among a few otherwise-dissimilar variations
- * r.r.a.space should be created whether the r.r.a.tech option is chosen or not If there is no opposition, these will become part of the evolving proposal.

Other notes:

- * A common concern was that the mail lists will need to match the newsgroups in order for this to work.
- * The question of which is supported more between the main set of newsgroups and the r.r.a.tech option is just as unclear as it was in the rra-reorg mail list. More discussion is needed we definitely need to resolve this.
- * a couple responses questioned the r.r.a.digital subhierarchy or whether the groups would be big enough to support a newsgroup of their own. Since this part of the proposal was brought up by r.r.a.packet users and unopposed by others from that group, more comments are needed, especially from r.r.a.packet.

Let the discussion continue... I'll try to put together a picture of what

looks like it can pass a vote as people say what they can support.

For reference - recap of RFD proposals

Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option I)

(all groups unmoderated)

Newsgroup name

rec.radio.amateur.misc

rec.radio.amateur.policy

rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip

rec.radio.amateur.operating

rec.radio.amateur.products

rec.radio.amateur.instruction

rec.radio.amateur.construction

rec.radio.amateur.space

rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services

description

all Ham radio topics not covered below i.e. video, stories, humor, new topics [no modification to existing newsgroup] regulations & policy issues [no modification to existing newsgroup] packet radio & other digital modes [includes old rec.radio.amateur.packet] TCP/IP via packet radio Operating procedures and questions: DX, CW, contests, propagation, repeaters manufactured equipment, modifications Ham radio instruction & examination homebrewing & experimentation amateur radio in space: satellites, earth-moon-earth (EME), shuttle, MIR emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS

Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option II - "the .tech option")

(all groups unmoderated)

Newsgroup name

rec.radio.amateur.misc

rec.radio.amateur.policy

rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip

rec.radio.amateur.operating

rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services

rec.radio.amateur.tech

description

all Ham radio topics not covered below i.e. video, stories, humor, new topics [no modification to existing newsgroup] regulations & policy issues [no modification to existing newsgroup] packet radio & other digital modes [includes old rec.radio.amateur.packet] TCP/IP via packet radio Operating procedures and questions: DX, CW, contests, propagation, repeaters emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS Technical discussions about Ham Radio: construction, satellites, theory, examinations, video

- - -

Ian Kluft KD6EUI PP-ASEL Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development ikluft@uts.amdahl.com Santa Clara, CA

 $[{\tt disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only - not those of my employer}]\\$

- -

Ian Kluft KD6EUI PP-ASEL Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
ikluft@uts.amdahl.com Santa Clara, CA
[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

Date: 1 Apr 93 13:55:27 CST

From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!wupost!udel!bogus.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!noc.msc.net!uc.msc.edu!raistlin!timbuk.cray.com!

hemlock.cray.com@saimiri.primate.wisc.edu

Subject: RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion summary 3/31]

To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In article <efB803hDceof00@amdahl.uts.amdahl.com>, ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian
Kluft) writes:

- > [...]
- > Tally so far: 13 in favor, 7 opposed, 8 unclear or undecided
- > Several of the "in favor" messages included modifications to the RFD which may
- > or may not be conditional. So this number represents 13 in favor of a split
- > but not necessarily for the exact proposal in the RFD.

So, what you're saying is that a grand total of 28 people have expressed an opinion and less than half of those were obviously for it?

> WHAT WE NEED TO DO NOW IS BRING TOGETHER THE SUGGESTIONS WE HAVE INTO A > $[\dots]$

Sigh...

[note news.groups deleted 'cos I'm sure they're sick of notes like this].

andyw. NOREN/G1XRL

andyw@aspen.cray.com Andy Warner, Cray Research, Inc. (612) 683-5835

Date: 1 Apr 93 20:29:11 GMT

From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!

darwin.sura.net!sgiblab!pacbell.com!amdahl!amdahl!jgt10@network.UCSD.EDU Subject: RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion summary 3/31]

To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

```
ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian Kluft) writes:
[... status and stuff deleted ...]
>Let the discussion continue... I'll try to put together a picture of what
>looks like it can pass a vote as people say what they can support.
>For reference - recap of RFD proposals
>-----
>Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option I)
>-----
>(all groups unmoderated)
>Newsgroup name
                                     description
>-----
                                     -----
>rec.radio.amateur.misc
                                     all Ham radio topics not covered below
                                     i.e. video, stories, humor, new topics
                                     [no modification to existing newsgroup]
>
>rec.radio.amateur.policy
                                     regulations & policy issues
                                     [no modification to existing newsgroup]
>rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc
                                     packet radio & other digital modes
                                     [includes old rec.radio.amateur.packet]
>rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip
                                     TCP/IP via packet radio
>rec.radio.amateur.operating
                                     Operating procedures and questions: DX,
                                     CW, contests, propagation, repeaters
                                     manufactured equipment, modifications
>rec.radio.amateur.products
>rec.radio.amateur.instruction
                                     Ham radio instruction & examination
>rec.radio.amateur.construction
                                     homebrewing & experimentation
>rec.radio.amateur.space
                                     amateur radio in space: satellites,
                                     earth-moon-earth (EME), shuttle, MIR
>rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services
                                     emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS
I feel the above breakdown is too fine.
>Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option II - "the .tech option")
>-----
>(all groups unmoderated)
>Newsgroup name
                                     description
>-----
>rec.radio.amateur.operating
                                     Operating procedures and questions: DX,
                                     CW, contests, propagation, repeaters
                                     emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS
>rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services
>rec.radio.amateur.tech
                                     Technical discussions about Ham Radio:
                                     construction, satellites, theory,
>
                                     examinations, video
```

I like the above breakdown. Although I wonder if there might be some cross over on the examination issues (as there might be on a lot of things for that matter).

And for that matter (just for good measure) add a

rec.radio.amateur.flame

Since we have issue that count as flame wars by any definition I've seen, let acknowledge them and send them to their own pergatory. (maybe that should be rec.radio.amatuer.static or rec.radio.static :)

A side issue that may help the implementation of a news group reorg. Part of the problem may be lack of knowledge of the definition of the groups. I would suggest a weekly 'reminder' of the group definitions.

John G. Thompson KD6KID

Amdahl Corporation
P.O. Box 3470 MS 340
Supply 210 CA 94088

jgt10@uts.amdahl.com
{sun,uunet}!amdahl!jgt10

Sunnyvale, CA 94088 1-408-737-5708

Go ahead, flame me...I've got heavy duty surge protectors.

[The opinions expressed above are mine, solely, and do not] [necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of Amdahl Corp.]

Date: 2 Apr 93 06:06:54 GMT

From: rtech!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion summary 3/31]

To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

andyw@aspen32.cray.com (Andy Warner) writes:

- >In article <efB803hDceof00@amdahl.uts.amdahl.com>, ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian Kluft) writes:
- >> Tally so far: 13 in favor, 7 opposed, 8 unclear or undecided
- >> Several of the "in favor" messages included modifications to the RFD which may
- >> or may not be conditional. So this number represents 13 in favor of a split
- >> but not necessarily for the exact proposal in the RFD.

>So, what you're saying is that a grand total of 28 people have expressed >an opinion and less than half of those were obviously for it?

Yes. When you ask people to do something out of the ordinary (like go all the way to news.groups and post something), don't expect everyone to jump to it. It just wouldn't be realistic. So the fact that those in favor

outnumbered the opposition like that is plenty of reason to continue with the effort. It may be even more important that the opposition didn't even outnumber the undecided's... but that wasn't by a significant margin.

Of those 28 people, many or most of them posted more than one article. I narrowed it down to the number of people because the article counts alone were skewed much more in favor of the RFD. People would surely have complained if that was what I had based the tally on. (Actually, someone complained anyway. Oh well, it's UseNet - that's what you have to expect. :-)

Hmmm... from the whole RFD experience, I can derive this:

Kluft's Laws of UseNet:

- 1. You can't please everyone
- 2. You can't get everything you want
- 3. You can't even escape unflamed
- :-) :-) simleys required here :-) I've been pleasantly surprised that no one has flamed me yet.

- -

Ian Kluft KD6EUI PP-ASEL Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
ikluft@uts.amdahl.com Santa Clara, CA
[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

End of Packet-Radio Digest V93 #87 ************